

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-4, 7, 14-16, and 25-30 are rejected. Claims 5-6, 8-13, and 17-24 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent forms (see e.g., 2/24/2009 Office Action, page 9). Applicant thanks with appreciation the Examiner indicating the allowance of claims 5-6, 8-13, and 17-24.

In this response, claims 2-3, 6, 15-16, 18, and 25-30 been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 14, 17, and 19-24 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim, in full, clear, concise, and exact terms, the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. In addition, new claims 31-33 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to include an allowable subject matter of claim 6 and its intervening claims 2-3. Claims 5 and 8 have been amended as an independent claim including limitations of claims 1-3. Claim 14 has been amended to include an allowable subject matter of claim 18 and its intervening claims 15-16. Claims 17 and 19 have been amended as an independent claim including limitations of claims 14-16. New claims 31-33 include limitations similar to the amended claims 1, 5, and 8 respectively. Applicant also amended some dependent claims for proper dependency and overcome the §101 and §112 rejections. Thus, all claims are now in condition of allowance.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-4, 7, 14-16, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 102(e) as being anticipated by Hammarlund et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,085,889 (hereinafter "Hammarlund"). In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the above rejections/objections have been overcome.

While Applicant does not concede that the Examiner's position is correct on the merits, Applicant has sought to obtain the claims that were objected to. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call/email the undersigned attorney.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: May 14, 2009

/Kevin G. Shao/
Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095
Kevin_Shao@bstz.com

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300